

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 and 27-31 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 5, 15, 17, 20, 21, 23 and 24 are amended for clarity (and for issues unrelated to patentability), claims 25-26 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and new claims 27-31 are added.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Office Action's indication that claims 3-5, 9, 10 and 15 contain allowable subject matter. However, as will be described below, all claims are believed to be allowable.

The Office Action objects to claim 15 because of informalities. By this Amendment, dependent claim 15 is amended to obviate the grounds for objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 11-14, 16-22 and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by U.S. Patent No. 6,850,771 to Malladi et al. (hereafter Malladi). The Office Action also rejects claims 6-8 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Malladi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,603,980 to Kitagawa et al. (hereafter Kitagawa). The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites increasing a power of a general control channel to a power level requested to demodulate a specific control channel once transmission of the specific control channel signal is executed and adjusting the increased power to meet a power level requested by a current general control channel transmission if the specific control channel transmission is completed.

Reply to Office Action dated October 31, 2006

Malladi relates to performing uplink power control during link imbalance that considers a reverse link HS-DPCH. Such uplink power control is performed with respect to pilot signal strength. That is, a RNC 108 monitors the pilot strength and determines whether to increase or decrease the target pilot signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) threshold T. See Malladi's col. 3, lines 12-35. Malladi relates to pilot signal strength and does not suggest the features with respect to the claimed general control channel and/or specific control channel.

The Office Action asserts that Malladi discloses increasing a power of a general control channel to a power level requested to demodulate a specific control channel once transmission of the specific control signal is executed. The Office Action cites Malladi's col. 2, lines 14-31, 40-47 and col. 3, lines 12-17 and 36-49. However, the cited sections merely disclose that a node-B 104, 106 can request UE 102 to increase or decrease the transmit power of the pilot signal based on a calculated SNR, that reduction of the pilot signal transmit power by the UE 102 causes reduction of the HS-DPCCH signal strength in proportion, that parameters may be monitored that are used in determining whether to increase or decrease the target pilot SNR threshold T, and that the RNC 108 can request that the target pilot SNR threshold be adjusted if it is unsatisfactory. This does not teach or suggest increasing a power of a general control channel to a power level requested to demodulate a specific control channel once transmission of the specific control channel is executed, as recited in independent claim 1. Malladi does not suggest features relating to a general control channel and/or a specific control channel.

The Office Action further asserts that the same cited sections of Malladi disclose adjusting the increased power to meet a power level requested by a current general control

Reply to Office Action dated October 31, 2006

channel transmission if the specific control channel transmission is completed. However, Malladi relates to adjusting pilot signal strength based on a signal-to-noise threshold T. This does not teach or suggest adjusting the increased power to a power level requested by a general control channel transmission if the specific control channel transmission is completed, as recited in independent claim 1.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Malladi does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Kitagawa does not teach or suggest the missing features of independent claim 1. Independent claim 1 therefore defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 16 recites applying a second power control method to the DPCCH transmission for at least a K_algo1 number of slots upon completion of HS-DPCCH (high speed dedicated physical control channel) transmission.

Malladi does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 16. The Office Action cites the same sections of Malladi to assert that Malladi suggests applying a second power control method to the DPCCH transmission for at least a K_algo1 number of slots upon completion of HS-DPCCH transmission. However, increasing or decreasing the target pilot signal-to-noise ratio threshold T based on unsatisfactory or satisfactory channel conditions between node-B and the UE does not teach or suggest applying a second power control method to the DPPCCH transmission for at least a certain number of slots upon completion of HS-DPCCH transmission, as recited in independent claim 16. Independent claim 16 states that a first power control method is used to transmit a DPCCH and a second power control method for DPCCH transmission for at least a number of slots upon completion of transmission of the

HS-DPCCH. Malladi's pilot SNR threshold level T does not teach or suggest these claimed features. Accordingly, Malladi does not teach or suggest applying a second power control method to the DPCCH transmission for at least a K_{algo1} number of slots upon completion of HS-DPCCH (high speed dedicated physical control channel) transmission, as recited in independent claim 16. Kitagawa does not teach or suggest the missing features of independent claim 16. Thus, independent claim 16 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 20 recites increasing a first uplink transmission power up to a second uplink transmission power such that a high speed control channel can be transmitted, and decreasing the second uplink transmission power back to the first uplink transmission control power after transmission of the high speed channel is completed. The cited sections of Malladi do not teach or suggest at least these features. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Malladi's pilot signal strength does not correspond to the features of the high speed control channel and the high speed channel. Kitagawa does not teach or suggest the missing features of independent claim 20. Thus, independent claim 20 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 28 recites adjusting an uplink transmission power from a first power level to a second power level, and performing transmission on a high-speed control channel using the adjusted uplink transmission power. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Malladi does not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 28. Thus, independent claim 28 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 16, 20 and 28 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the

Serial No. 10/700,041
Reply to Office Action dated October 31, 2006

Docket No. P-0613

independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-24 and 27-31 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK/DCO/kah

Date: January 31, 2007

\\Fk4\Documents\2000\2000-717\109054.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610